

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/772,207	LANGE ET AL.	
	Examiner Trang Doan	Art Unit 2131	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Trang Doan. (3) Benjamin Keim.

(2) Thanhnga Truong. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 January 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,10,12,16,19,29 and 38.

Identification of prior art discussed: Larry Koved.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



THANHNGA TRUONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant discussed the 112 2th rejection regarding the "managed code". He pointed out the section in the Applicant's specification to further explain the meaning of "managed code". Examiner agreed with the Applicant's argument, therefore the 112 2th rejection will be withdrawn. Examiner suggested to the Applicant to amend all the independent claims to overcome the 101 rejection. He agreed to amend all the independent claims to overcome the 101 and 112 rejections raised by Examiner during the interview. Regarding the 102 rejection, the Applicant argued Koved did not teach claims 10, 16 and 19. Examiner will review the prior art again and will withdraw the prior art if the prior did not teach those limitations. However, no further analysis/search will be made until the formal written response is received. No agreement was reached at this time for allowance.